601

The extent of the Washo kinship system is elastic, but usually the range of recognized relatives is not extensive. Second cousins are brothers and sisters, but relationships are rarely traced that far. The children of grandparents' siblings are properly aunts and uncles (e.g., father's father's brother's daughter may be called father's sister, for father and his father's brother's daughter call each other brother and sister), but these relatives are usually not called aunts and uncles. Often my informants did not know the identity of the children of their grandparents' siblings; when they did know these persons, they sometimes called them by general terms meaning "my friend or distant relative." Occasionally, however, a person would call a child of a grandparent's sibling by the appropriate uncle or aunt term. Since the Washo are forbidden to marry relatives, a minute tracing of relationships would make it difficult to find a mate. This may account for the infrequency with which distant relatives are recognized.

[582]

POLITE AFFINAL TERMS

601
576

The Washo use a set of polite, teknonymous terms for most affinal relatives. These are given in table 2. One informant gave two polite terms for sister's husband. He was called di?i·sa bumé·li? (my older sister's husband) as well as dimá·gu dagóy? (my sister's child's father). My notes contain only one polite term for brother's wife (my brother's child's mother); I have not recorded the logically possible term "my older [or younger] brother's wife." This suggests that the use of descriptive terms with "mother" in them may be more strongly prescribed than those containing "father." On the other hand, my informants may simply have failed to mention the descriptive term "my older [or younger] brother's wife." Since I did not explicitly investigate all the possible descriptive terms which may logically be used for affinal relatives, table 2 may not give a complete list of terms. Nevertheless, the essentials of the system are presented.

7:Freed E-5 (1952-1957)1960 NT20 Washo NT20
[P.358,C]
601
576

TABLE 2

Polite Affinal Terms

English	Washo	Literal translation
son-in-law	le?dleli? dagóy? (m. sp.); legú?yi? dagóy? (w. sp.)	daughter's child's father; daughter's child's father
daughter-in-law.....	labá·ɬa? dalá? (m. sp.); legú?yi? dalá? (w. sp.)	son's child's mother; son's child's mother
father-in-law	dibumé·li? dagóy? (w. sp.)	husband's father
wife's brother	diɲá?miɲ dadá?a	children's mother's brother
husband's brother.....	diɲá·m de?éwši?	son's father's brother
sister's husband	dimá·gu dagóy? di?í·sa bumé·li?	sister's child's father older sister's husband
brother's wife	dimáš dalá? (m. sp.)	brother's child's mother
brother's wife	dišémuk dalá? (w. sp.)	brother's child's mother

125
602

The informant is provided with slips of paper containing Washo kinship terms written quasiphonetically for all the relatives he possesses in first ascending, ego's, and first descending generations. These, of course, differ from person to person. The informant is then asked to arrange the slips of paper in a column in response to each of the sixteen questions. The relative ranking highest in the behavior questioned is to be placed at the top of the column; the remainder are to be ranked in descending order, with the one ranking lowest in the behavior in question to be placed at the bottom. The first few questions are for practice and designed to acquaint the informant with the kind of response desired. The investigator asks "which of your relatives weighs most . . . is tallest . . . is oldest" or some other similar question, and instructs the informant to arrange the slips of paper, helping him if necessary. Once the "set" of the experiment is established, the questionnaire is administered. The questions are explained to the informant, using examples if necessary; they are not read mechanically. The informant's responses are noted for each question, and the paper slips are shuffled before the next question is given. The result is a test protocol ranking a person's relatives in each of the sixteen categories of interpersonal behavior.

Several precautions must be observed if the test results are to attain their maximum reliability. First, the investigator must determine the opportunity the informant has had for knowing and interacting with the relatives to be included in the test. If there has been a reasonable opportunity for interacting with a relative, he is to be included in the test even if the informant has had little interaction with him. If there has been no opportunity for interaction, the relative should be excluded. For example, if a relative has lived close to the informant for many years, he is to be included even though the informant rarely sees him. In this case, the opportunity for interaction exists, and the fact that none has taken place may be an important feature of the role behavior. However, if a relative died when the informant was a baby, or lives at a great distance, or is feeble-minded, he is to be excluded, for the informant has had no opportunity to interact with him.

124
125

Second, the same interpreter should be used for all informants. This should not be taken too literally, for feuds and hard feelings can make the presence of particular interpreters unpleasant to informants. In addition, if the interpreter is related to the informant, this might tend to influence the informant's responses. It is probably best to use an interpreter who is not related to the informant. This precaution could not be observed for two Washo informants owing to the prevailing rules of courtesy. These two informants were slightly deaf and it was necessary to shout at them. Among the Washo, it is considered impolite for a person to shout at a nonrelative. Therefore, relatives had to be used as interpreters.

[576]

125

Third, the testing situation should be standardized. This means that as few relatives as possible should be looking over the informant's shoulder while he is taking the test. An easy way to shed distracting relatives is to conduct the interview in an automobile.

Fourth, the questions should be asked randomly. I suspect that there is some contagion from one question to the next. This is enhanced if, for example, all the questions probing dominance are asked one after the other. By randomizing the questions, the investigator